

Forest Health Strategy Work Group

August 18, 2004: Fourth Meeting
University of Washington, HUB, Room 108
Spokane, Washington

Members Present:

Pat McElroy, Chair, DNR Staff
Karen Ripley, Coordinator, DNR Staff
Vicki Lee, Secretary/Meeting Minutes, DNR Staff
Rich Fonda, Fire Ecologist, WWU
Maurice Williamson, Small Forest Landowner Advisory Committee
Steve Tveit, Boise Cascade
Mike Petersen, The Lands Council
Bob Gara, Forest Entomologist, UW College of Forest Resources
Rick Brazell, USDA Forest Service
Bruce Lippke, UW College of Forest Resources

Absent:

Mike Blankenship, Ferry County Commissioner
Barry Moore, WSU Dept. of Natural Resource Science
Peter Heide, Washington State Society of American Foresters
John Mankowski, WA Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
Ron Shultz, Executive Policy Advisor, Governor's Executive Policy Office
John St. Pierre, Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation

Guests:

Elaine Oneil, UW College of Forest Resources
Larry Mason, UW, Rural Technology Initiative
Karl Denison, USDA Forest Service, (designated back-up for Rick Brazell)
Mark Gray, DNR, Resource Protection Assistant Manager
Howard Thronson, Product, Sales and Leasing Manager – DNR, State Lands
George Shelton, State Lands Assistant Manager – DNR, SE Region
Jim Plampin – Quinault Indian Nation
Roje Gootee, WSU PhD Candidate
Alicia Paatsch, House of Representatives, Fiscal Analyst

CALL TO ORDER:

Pat McElroy called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m. Introductions were made. A safety briefing was given. McElroy made a motion to review and approve the minutes from the July 27th meeting; minutes were approved. McElroy went over the agenda for the day.

1 **National Fire Plan Presentation – Mark Gray (handout: hard copy of presentation)**

2 Mark Gray stated the National Fire Plan (NFP) mission is to “Contribute to reducing the risks of wildfire
3 to communities and the environment by building collaboration at all levels of government.” The Western
4 Governors Association (WGA) 10-Year Strategy is to 1) Improve Fire Prevention and Suppression, 2)
5 Reduce Hazardous Fuels, 3) Restore Fire and Ecosystems, and 4) Promote Community Assistance. Gray
6 described WGA’s Guiding Principles: 1) Priority setting emphasizing the protection of communities and
7 other high-priority watersheds at-risk, 2) Collaboration among governments, and 3) Accountability
8 through performance measures and monitoring. DNR is assigned to carry out the 10-year strategy and
9 Healthy Forests Restoration Act (HFRA) by: 1) Maintain a prioritized list of communities at risk, 2)
10 Collaborate in the development of Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPP), and approve the
11 contents of the plans, 3) Collaboratively develop annual fuel treatment plans, and 4) Monitor
12 effectiveness of fuel treatment projects. Communities at risk bound by one or more census blocks, are
13 evaluated with Risk Assessment Management Strategies (RAMS) Community Assessment module.
14 Communities are identified and named in collaboration with Local Coordinating Groups (LCGs). CWPP
15 provide incentives for USFS and BLM to give consideration to the priorities of local communities as they
16 develop and implement forest management and hazardous fuel reduction projects. If communities near
17 federal land develop a plan they have a better chance of getting a grant and having complementary work
18 take place on federal land.

19
20 Rich Fonda asked what the State’s position was on granting money to tribes. **Answer:** Tribes do their
21 own assessments; BIA also provides grants.

22
23 McElroy clarified all grant money comes from the Feds; there is no State money.

24
25 Fonda commented that needed to change.

26
27 Gray talked about GIS mapping for communities at risk, and showed some of the maps.

28 **Action:** Need statewide map with federal tribal lands risk indicated. Need to show all the high hazard
29 areas.

30
31 Gray went on to say we needed to collaboratively develop annual fuel treatment plans by using local
32 coordination groups. The LCGs would: 1) Coordinate development of landscape-wide fuel hazard
33 assessments and reduction plans, 2) Determine priorities for fuel hazard reduction, education and
34 prevention needs, etc., 3) Coordinate education and prevention programs, 4) Coordinate local

1 preparedness plans and feedback to subgeographic areas regarding needs, 5) Foster public support for
2 meeting NFP goals and providing credible public information, and 6) Information conduit for information
3 on NFP issues. Union Valley in Chelan County is a successful story. They understand risk via fires, have
4 received outreach from the DNR, have gotten cost share for fuel breaks, and their community leaders
5 have emerged and are engaged.

6
7 Steve Tveit pointed out Union Valley was successful, but very labor intensive to get them in a place to be
8 able to do it themselves.

9
10 Gray agreed that Southeast Region has 72 communities with only one fuels specialist.

11
12 **Option:** DNR has templates and maps available on the Internet map server, which can be downloaded.
13 Gray offered we have assembled what we think will be helpful to develop these plans, such as; fire risk
14 maps, transportation, fire regime maps, condition class maps, and slope, all through RAMS.

15
16 Gray described the hierarchy of National Fire Plan administrators. There is a National Wildland Fire
17 Leadership Council. In Washington and Oregon at the Pacific Northwest Region 6, we have a National
18 Fire Plan Strategy Team, with a NFP Coordinator named Bonnie Wood. Their function is to coordinate
19 and share information between the federal agencies, state and local counties and the other organizations
20 that are interested in the NFP. They have a subcommittee that is trying to bring the various federal grant
21 programs that operate at the Washington and Oregon level into one process, instead of five. At the local
22 level we have established LCGs, which include counties, fire marshals, and fire districts. In the Northeast
23 we have five LCGs; in the Southeast we have four. In monitoring effectiveness of fuel treatment projects,
24 there still remains a gap. Projects need to be tracked better; we need a program or plan. Gray displayed a
25 list of references, which are also in the handout. They are all electronic and can be put in an e-mail. (Or
26 linked to FHSWG site)

27
28 Karl Denison stated that there is money for schools and roads, and money for projects that comes through
29 106.393 payments to counties. There are Title III funds for fire planning, and Title II funds for treatments
30 and community planning. This bill is up for re-authorization.

31
32 Maurice Williamson stated he thought we had spent enough time on dealing with the symptoms, the bill
33 was not designed to address WUI, it was designed to address forest health. Very little thought has been
34 spent on WUI areas; we assume those are basically going to be taken care of through ongoing federal
35 efforts.

36
37 Steve Tveit said we need public support for work. One thing he saw missing out of this presentation was
38 watersheds being identified. Tveit went on to say the State is very good about collaboration, but that is
39 not solving the problem.

40
41 Bruce Lippke asked how costly is it all? (WUI or uplands)

42
43 McElroy described two projects near Greenwater along Hwy 410 in western Washington, an area that is
44 subject to east winds. If you get a fire in there homes will be lost. In the last three years 50 percent of the
45 homeowners replaced their roofs with metal roofs. This is a direct result of the work DNR has been
46 doing. We don't have public acceptance of responsibility. People don't want to be told where they

1 should build their homes. Counties need to be responsive to growth management limitations.
2 Demonstration areas are an important tool.

3
4 Mike Peterson commented that he looks at the deal as an unfunded mandate. Today's presentation is a
5 practical way to start getting there.

6
7 McElroy advised that the legislature asks us to recommend what it would take in terms of a budget, and
8 figure out what needs to be done.

9
10 Howard Thronson stated that forest health is more than just fires. It is also the loss of forest productivity
11 and commercial value, and the insects and disease. Individual landowners have to decide what's good; if
12 a Silvicultural treatment could be applied to their land based upon their objectives. The forest landowners
13 must identify there is a need. The big thing is county government is allowing homes to be built in areas at
14 risk. It is an outcome of a political decision separate from the forest health issue. So if we are going to
15 address forest health and define what it is, we have a Silvicultural curfew rather than a public response to
16 fire or housing zoning or whatever else.

17
18 McElroy explained when it comes to fire; government agencies can only do what legislation authorizes.
19 Cities and towns offer fire protection through fire departments/districts. Forestlands are protected by
20 DNR. Local communities can form fire protection districts for improved or unimproved areas, but they
21 are not required to, and if they don't there is no default. So in some areas of eastern Washington we have
22 areas with no fire protection. DNR is not authorized nor obligated to provide structure protection.

23
24 **Forest Insect and Disease Control Law 76.06, Compare and Contrast Washington Laws, Review**
25 **and Discussion of the Merits and Drawbacks of Different Laws, and Discuss Appropriate**
26 **Components of a Forest Health Law – Karen Ripley (handouts: RCW 76.06 Key points; 76.06.010 –**
27 **76.06.110, and 76.06.130; and Chapter 76.04 RCW Forest Protection)**

28 Karen Ripley informed the members that for many years RCW 76.06 has authorized and instructed DNR
29 to provide control to insects and tree disease. In the official law that was written in 1951, and last used in
30 1968, there was not a distinguishment between exotic insect and diseases vs. native insect and diseases. If
31 landowners had a problem DNR would declare an "infestation district" and instruct landowners on how to
32 control, destroy or eradicate the insects and diseases. If the landowner fixed the problem they were
33 resolved, if they could not or would not fix the problem; then DNR would impose a treatment and bill
34 them 25 percent of the cost. The basis of this law was these insects were a public nuisance or a threat. It
35 was the landowner's responsibility to take care of them when informed. If they didn't then DNR would
36 step in and take care of it for them. Ripley stated major flaws make this law out of date. No longer is it
37 legal to have DNR declare a taxing district. Landowners have to vote now. Another thing that makes the
38 law unworkable is there is no relationship with the forest practice rules. For example now you can't
39 apply insecticide from the air unless you have a forest practice permit. One of the things that our group is
40 seeking is the consensus of how we can resolve the legal attention for forest health.

41
42 Rick Brazell advocates that we need to help landowners find the money to figure out ways to help them
43 do it.

44
45 McElroy advised that one of the decisions we have to address is what is the role of the landowner, and
46 what is the role of the State. He pointed out in addition to the two aspects of this law that make it
47 unworkable for forest health mentioned in the presentation, in the 1950s the concept prevailed that when
48 you have a thing, kill the thing. Don't treat the underlying cause. It is a requirement to control, destroy
49 and eradicate native insects and diseases, which would be undesirable and nearly impossible.

1 Denison asked for a review of the \$50,000 deductible rule. **Answer:** That's a Landowner Contingency
2 fire, a fire that is caused in the course of a landowner operation that does not involve negligence. Forest
3 landowners pay an assessment that is fire insurance into the Landowner Contingency Fund. The operator
4 is responsible for up to \$50,000 of the suppression expenses. Small landowners' deductible is much less.
5 Any landowner pays all costs if they are negligent.

6
7 Denison suggested looking at expanding the definition of negligence.

8
9 Peterson noted that it was affirmed from our last meeting that there is a difference in objectives on federal
10 and private land. We do not allow an epidemic level of insects on state and private land, as there is a
11 desire to control; but it might be more acceptable on federal land.

12
13 Rich Fonda added that extreme hazards, natural or created, must be controlled. Mutually agreed upon
14 coercion is needed.

15
16 McElroy emphasized there is a point where the State plays a major role in forest protection, and that is
17 including the Forest Fire Protection Assessment. So maybe we ought to look at the fire model. There is a
18 shared responsibility between the forest landowner and society at large in Washington to pay for the
19 protection of forestland from wildfire. Each forest landowner pays an assessment on a regular basis that
20 is a contribution to the general fund. It provides for the basic infrastructure of fire protection across the
21 state. So if we actually have a fire it is paid for in one of three ways: 1) Public funds which are a
22 combination of State General Funds (supplemented by the forest fire protection assessment), and FEMA,
23 2) If result of landowner operation, the landowner contingency fund pays (after the deductible the
24 landowner pays for that fire), or 3) If a negligent fire, person who caused fire pays all costs.

25
26 Need to bridge liability and motivate the landowner to manage timber in a certain way. Don't just use
27 public funds to buy hose; buy thinning.

28
29 Williamson suggested a tiered approach, treat symptoms, go with a wellness approach, educate. Inform
30 what is required. If not working we can recommend. If you don't have a hammer they will ignore.

31
32 Tveit said in regards to fire, liability comes from activity, whereas, in forest health liability comes from
33 inactivity. It's very tough to pin down.

34
35 Ripley pointed out the noxious weed plan has several layers. It puts an emphasis on annually updating
36 statewide priorities.

37
38 Peterson suggested putting a Forest Health assessment on people's land to create a pool of money like an
39 insurance policy. Use it for an incentive for the landowners who treat their lands, so that they would pay
40 less tax.

41
42 Williamson stated that two percent of the people in the State own commercial forestland. They are
43 shouldering the public trust responsibility for the public. They are providing clean water, habitat for
44 animals, and plants, and they feel like they have been badly abused.

45
46 McElroy said potentially we already have that mechanism in place, the Landowner Contingency Fund.
47 We collect funds from small and large landowners. This is an insurance policy. If an accidental fire
48 occurs in the course of landowner business it pays all of the costs after \$50,000 the deductible. That
49 statute could be amended to allow dollars for emergency response to insect or disease outbreak if we

1 needed to take action between legislative sessions. Otherwise we have to go to the legislature, go through
2 the budget and it will take at least a year or two years before you have any response. We should be able
3 to use it as an interim measure. The balance in this fund cannot exceed three million dollars.
4 Ripley asked could the money be used for other work in addition to suppression?

5
6 Williamson stated that it's the Commissioner's discretion to use some money for abatement of extreme
7 hazards, but not equipment for fire readiness. Some landowners say its ok to use dollars for forest health
8 solutions. It's the landowners' money. The legislature has already stolen the interest from that money.
9 It's quite an endeavor to embark upon. Williamson suggests we get counsel directly from the landowner
10 representatives before we make a firm recommendation to avoid a political response.

11
12 A discussion ensued on forest fire protection assessment vs. landowner contingency fund. Ripley noted
13 there was a problem with the matrix chart, that it doesn't clearly define these differences in funding.

14
15 It was asked what law is provided for this. **Answer:** RCW 76.04, (Larry Mason had a copy faxed over to
16 the meeting, and made copies for all the members). 76.04.610 describes the forest fire protection
17 assessment paid by all forest landowners for readiness, prevention, and suppression. 76.04.630 describes
18 the Landowner Contingency Fund.

19
20 Denison asked, so the basic question on the table is, Should the uses of the Landowner Contingency Fund
21 be expanded?

22
23 McElroy advised we should think about that as one possibility as a source. The DNR and the State have a
24 role in identifying and delineating areas of forest health problems and concerns.

25
26 Williamson added we need to be consistent in methodology for how to do assessments.

27
28 Ripley said data is not readily available on local forest conditions and we need to get it.

29
30 McElroy stated that it is the opinion of this group, (most people in this group) that the State should
31 assemble the data.

32
33 Fonda expressed that it is his opinion that there are holes in the presentations that need to be filled in. We
34 need data.

35
36 Bob Gara pointed out that historically forest fire prevention has involved a propaganda program,
37 education program and fuels management program all directed towards eliminating fire. We can focus on
38 a matrix of using those forest fire management programs we have and really fine-tune them to include
39 insect and disease management. Fire has been a lynchpin through all of this.

40
41 Williamson agrees, but how will we explain this to the general public and the small landowners without
42 getting a negative response?

43
44 Denison liked what Williamson said earlier about a tiered approach. Wellness should be first thing from
45 an educational stand point, secondly if your property is a hazard, then landowner should be provided
46 hazard incentives, and third if landowner is inactive, should use hammer approach and have a liability or
47 tax.

48
49 Williamson urged not to dilute forest health aspect with fire.

50
51 Tveit indicated that the public does link forest health and fire.

1 Fonda said a third point to raise is you need to be proactive. I think we should take a look at health
2 insurance companies, for example Group Health. Wellness gets you a free visit. If you have a problem
3 you have to co-pay. I think you would see a major increase in forest health.

4
5 Peterson thought it was a good idea. Looking at the root causes it becomes more complicated. You can't
6 write silvicultural prescriptions into law. Fuel treatments may not work for everything such as animals,
7 watersheds, etc.

8
9 Ripley asked how would we go about pulling this off?

10
11 Tveit suggested a flow chart.

12
13 Identify and locate hazard and risk.

14 Preparedness/Prevention elements

15 ❖ Voluntary

16 ❖ Regulatory

17 ❖ Information and education

18 ❖ Standards for fire precaution

19 Detection

20 Initial attack

21 Sustained Attack

22 Concentrate our efforts on voluntary, regulatory and information and education.

23
24 Gara stated with all the laws, the most flexible are in the Noxious Weed Program.

25
26 Fonda suggested triage then action.

27
28 McElroy pointed out that 76.04.600 talks about the landowners' responsibility, and 76.04.610 talks about
29 landowner paying an assessment so not to have to do suppression.

30
31 Fonda pointed out 76.04.630 Landowner Contingency Forest Fire Suppression Account, on page 22,
32 second paragraph, second sentence, "The department may, when moneys are available from the
33 Landowner Contingency Forest Fire Suppression Account, expend moneys for summarily abating,
34 isolating, or reducing an extreme fire hazard."

35
36 McElroy asked if this has ever been used to abate a fire hazard. **Answer:** Yes, in 1973 in Wahkiakum
37 County they did abatement but never recovered the costs.

38
39 **Pursuing Forest Health Improvements: Successful Strategies & Continuing Challenges – George**
40 **Shelton (handouts: hard copy of presentation, and Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) Amendment**
41 **No. 1 book)**

42 George Shelton showed a map of DNR Southeast Region managed lands. The region has 15 counties,
43 and over 300,000 acres of forestland. He named three significant Forest Health issues they have: 1)
44 Unsustainable forest conditions exist throughout SE Region forestlands, 2) Loss of habitat due to
45 overstocked and poorly managed stands, and 3) Potential for forest health epidemic and catastrophic
46 wildfire is extremely high. Shelton displayed another map of the Forest Pest conditions from the 2003
47 aerial detection survey. The Region embarked on a plan to improve forest health. Their basic
48 assumptions were: 1) Existing inventory data and computer models were good enough, and 2) All
49 changes would be consistent with the northern spotted owl conservation strategies in the HCP. The
50 approach is to focus on overstocked stands and species composition. Shelton pointed out the Region's
51 stocking and volume removal correction to obtain sustainable forest conditions was calculated to be over

1 600 million bf. They will accomplish significant improvements by focusing on the ground to determine
2 the desired future forest, as indicated by plant associations: 1) Soil temperature, moisture and nutrients, 2)
3 Slope, 3) Aspect, 4) Precipitation, 5) Elevation, and 6) Vegetation-timber species at or moving toward
4 late seral (climax). He used the Glenwood Sub-Landscape Vegetative Series as an example. Shelton
5 described the steps develop a desired future forest for the Grand fir warm series. He talked about
6 implementation and collaborative relationships with YIN, USFWS, WDFW, and TFW partners. The
7 consensus is without timely management the forests will self-destruct in Eastern Washington. It's not
8 what you remove that's important – it's what you leave! He explained we had to integrate Forest Health
9 into our HCP. He displayed a map showing the Glenwood Sub-Landscape HCP strategy prior to
10 amendment, and the amended HCP strategy. The Klickitat HCP Planning Unit was also amended,
11 resulting in an increased harvest level of 50 percent. The biological reality is we will now be able to grow
12 and sustain the habitat.

13
14 Shelton also addressed What if we put up 60 MMBF up for sale and nobody would buy it? He pointed
15 out the steps they have taken: 1) BT application to buy time in Western Spruce Budworm affected areas
16 (our actual costs were \$30/acre which equaled more options and a pay-off of \$3,000/acre), 2) Purchaser
17 tours to sell products (more sales, Scribner and weight), 3) Cashing out cull logs, 4) Dividing large sales
18 and shortening contracts, and 5) Offering a mix of sales large and small (generally put out one 14 million
19 bf sale per year, the majority are 1-4 million bf). A sale is only named "Forest Health Sale" when it is
20 outside our normal procedures (e.g., acreage, volume, or habitat thresholds). All are within forest
21 practices rules (riparian protection). Shelton announced the sale results for Forest Health Sales. There
22 were ten sold sales, amounting to 75 MMBF on 5,000 acres, for a value of \$18,139,892. There are four
23 planned sales for FY05, for a total of 15 MMBF, on 2,100 acres. The value is undetermined at this time.
24 He added stumpage prices are good for Grand fir, Douglas fir and Ponderosa Pine. He explained there are
25 still some sales without buyers, example: Glenwood small diameter sale (1,500 acres). Also, there is no
26 small wood market in Chelan and Kittitas Counties. Shelton emphasized underburning is not a viable
27 option; there are high risks, high costs, and a lack of clearly defined objectives. Shelton summarized
28 Southeast Region's Goals: 1) Deal with majority of overstocked stands within ten-years, 2) Amend the
29 HCP for the Yakima and Chelan Planning Units, 3) Promptly salvage and re-forest acreage lost to
30 wildfire, and 4) Promote active stand management over all habitat designations.

31
32 Rich Fonda asked, "What authority did you use to do this work? **Answer:** 79.01 Manage State trust lands
33 for today and the future.

34
35 Does 79.01 solve forest health concerns on state lands? No. There is political uncertainty via DNR
36 leadership. All State lands are not equal, simply by virtue of shared objectives. All landowners are also
37 not equal, because of different constraints.

38
39 Collaborative relationships mean each sale equals a trust builder. We should not throw away
40 irreplaceable pieces.

41
42 You need to know what you're managing for. Is there soil survey statewide and inventory information
43 statewide? Yes – soils. No – inventory. Is there plant association information for all landowners? Yes.
44 The plant association map, plus the DNR state lands' desired future condition of that zone.

45
46 Has DNR done analysis on Southeast Region's lower productivity sites? Yes. When it grows back to
47 owl habitat we'll leave it and allow heavier management on other places. On lower elevations where Pine
48 meets grass, sustainable economics disappears. We need to reduce stocking and generate options.

49
50 How has DNR protected soil resources? This is not a big issue on drier soils. Moreover, these sales are
51 not typical sales. A normal partial cutting leaves 40-50 percent cover. Most sales mark the tree removals.

Individual sales are all subject to SEPA. Forest Practices are subject to appeal. Forest Practice Board is subject to appeal. The HCP amendment is subject to lawsuit under NEPA. We have a problem, how do you get support? What can we do to fix it? The committee can build a consensus. How do we facilitate willing landowners? We remove the impediments. How do we deal with recalcitrant landowners?
1) Create incentives, 2) Regulatory.

Discussion: Outline of a Strategic Plan. Expanding the Outline – Karen Ripley and Karl Denison
(handout: Draft of Washington Forest Health Strategic Plan)

Denison agreed to be the facilitator, and Ripley wrote down ideas and changes to be made on the draft outline from the group. Here is the content from the flip charts:

Page 1, Line 25: change “leadership role” to over arching role.

79.01 Trust Land Statutes provide the direction to DNR as a trust lands manager

Background

Line 9-13, Can indicators be quantified? “Appropriate,” “minimal”. How to set standards.

Preamble has no legal basis. If Legislative intent...does have implication.

Strengthen with: “So what” What’s at risk or at stake for Washington?

Losses:

❖ X acres=adversely affected, \$ being lost

❖ Wildlife and water need protection. If habitat cover burns up on federal land, privates have to provide it. (Need state involvement on Federal lands)

Benefits

Not just timber or forest products.

Two drivers: Economic: landowner, viable forest industry
Environmental

Whereas, what’s the problem? What to do? PP2↔PP1 (switch)

Take from legislation and forest practices statues.

Benefit environmental and economic interests. List a bunch.

Karen re-writes.....

Report to Legislature, What should we do about it?

Key Findings

❖ Sustainability needs to be emphasized both environmentally and economically.

❖ Economic – not foreclosing options is positive.

❖ LMS simulations describe improved growth to pay for treatments.

❖ Will need some subsidy, some subset of activities are not economically sustainable; forest health efforts can not cover all costs.

❖ Different LO do not have same ability to respond (size, markets, requirements for return).

❖ Different objectives, different owners

❖ Vision? Strategy approach=multi-tiered.

❖ Third bullet: keep the concept that treatment of problem not treatment of symptoms.

- 1 ❖ Need adequate data to support decision-making
- 2 ❖ Acceptances of smoke – integrate with last bullet and enumerate.
- 3 ❖ Liability of prescribed fire.
- 4 ❖ DNR role “appropriate”
- 5 ❖ Wildfire risk around communities will drive
- 6 ❖ Fire/Fuels=lynchpin
- 7 ❖ Bullet 4: should we have data to support that?
- 8 ○ Provide costs, savings data with choices.
- 9 ○ Works for initial action. Obtain data for later choices? Some=closer than others
- 10 **Barrier**
- 11 ❖ Funding availability
- 12 ❖ Private property rights
- 13 It’s expensive to divert from past practices, requires **large** incentive. Consider non-market benefits and
- 14 savings to justify.
- 15 Land is in a mess. Big fix=clean slate (Commercially viable? Aesthetically? Diversity?)
- 16 Account for unforeseen consequences. We describe needed studies, etc.
- 17 **Vision for Plan**
- 18 Page 1, Line 43-46, Needs preamble, “Need data to support decision-making.”
- 19 Goal=vision for forests. (Add economic sustainability)
- 20 Check strategy areas, activity areas, and appendices
- 21 Correct Page 1, Line 45, eliminate “that”
- 22 List key elements in vision paragraph
- 23 Eliminate on Page 2, Line 2 & 3 sentence, or add on Page 2, Line 3, “Resistant to catastrophic losses
- 24 from...”
- 25 Wildlife – need to say fish? No (in watershed function)
- 26 + Property damage
- 27 DNR’s protection responsibilities: 1) Life, 2) Resources, 3) Property (Fire districts’ responsibility. DNR
- 28 protects property if no fire district.)
- 29 **Outcome**
- 30 ❖ People need to take more leadership responsibility in protecting own property.
- 31 ❖ Plan will take proactive approach.
- 32 ❖ Plan will improve Forest Health.
- 33 ❖ “Negative surprise” idea needs work

Outline

Does legislature expect alternatives? Array of possible actions?

Yes, for funding.

Yes – Which forum should be extended? Advisory Committee

Needs mechanism

- ❖ Prioritizing along timeline

- ❖ Tracking targets

- ❖ “Create long-term benchmarks”

Page 2, **Under Strategic Areas Considered in Plan**, Ecological Aspects missing.

Does “sci-based” cover?

Ecological impacts...describe to avoid mistrust.

Page 2, Line 19, not “artful”

Bring it out. 19, Line 28-30→pull out

Emphasize what forest management will be leaving

Administrative Aspects

Page 2, Line 31 & 29, public involvement

Include stakeholder involvement (not just agencies)

Collaboration

- ❖ Describe outcome? Or Process?

- ❖ Buy-in

- ❖ Trustful relationships

- ❖ Were heard

- ❖ Participated

Page 2, Line 45, Prevention activities: add restoration activities

What’s public safety infrastructure (Line 38)?

Page 3, Line 3, “funding alternatives and sources”

Page 3, Line 1-3, same or different source vs. where goes

Page 3, Line 1, “Implement?” No, “develop” a state program

Continue to implement federal grant program

Compensation for providing benefits/goods (contract w/incentives)

- Example: Forest riparian easement compensation program

- No gifting of state funds (Not constitutional)

Ripley suggested we stop and discuss locations for meetings, as some members had to catch an early plane. The decision was made to keep the dates the same for October 13 & 14th Spokane meeting.

Members were advised to call ahead to the Ramada Inn at the Airport in Spokane for Reservations, as it was going to be a busy week at the Ramada. Phone Number 509-838-5211. Ripley asked for location choices for the November 9th meeting. The three suggestions were:

1. Snoqualmie Pass, at the State Parks Building - Hyak

2. Ellensburg, DNR Regional Office
 3. Cle Elum, at Forest Service Building
- Action:** Ripley will check into the possibility of having our meeting at one of these locations, and report back to members at September meeting in Moses Lake.

Discussion: Outline of a Strategic Plan. Expanding the Outline (continued)

Incentives=lynchpin

- ❖ Forest Practice permit longer term than two years
- ❖ Motivation:
 - Fund Stewardship Extension program
- ❖ Prevention, education, outreach: Separate prevention from education and outreach
- ❖ Break out strategy vs. action items
- Best management practices and technical assistance:
 - NRCS technical guide is obsolete
- ❖ Educate practitioners, Page 3, Lines 11 & 41
- ❖ Demonstration sites: important and must be strategically placed. (Pack Forest, L.T. Murray)
 - Formalize establishment
 - “Front Country” so can be accessible.
- ❖ Streaming Video←put on PBS, Internet, distance learning
- ❖ Recognition (Sunset Magazine)
- ❖ More staff – what will it take to implement program?
- ❖ Develop recommended staffing ←(gather data, monitoring, follow up on effects of treatment)
- ❖ Risk reduction
- ❖ Fuel treatment layout
- ❖ FIA data provide a representative statistical grid. The data are not sufficient to do a strategic plan, develop a landscape risk model, prioritize projects.

Assessment

- ❖ Convince policy makers to provide dollars
- ❖ Help LO’s needs
- ❖ What’s DNR role?
- ❖ Need to calibrate GIS data from Satellite images

How/what/and where to do about it?

Don’t have enough information

- ❖ Teach people to recognize it

- ❖ CWPP should include
 - Insects and disease issues
 - Consideration of adjacent forest land
- ❖ Major landowners could identify where to focus treatments=professional judgment
- ❖ Develop tactical strategies for assessment
 - CWPP template
 - Non-tribal and non-federal and forest land: State 17% and Private 83%

Some topics for next meeting:

- ❖ Incentives
- ❖ Break down into three groups, prevention, education, and outreach
- ❖ Putting existing data into GIS
- ❖ Public recognition (important to reward)
- ❖ Risk Maps
- ❖ Need more than an FIA database
- ❖ Go over second draft of Strategic Plan

Action: Ripley and McElroy will go over recommendations and changes, update, and handout second draft at next meeting.

Ripley informed the members on Monday, September 20th, DNR will report to the Senate and give them an update on the FHSWG.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

The next meeting will be 9:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Wednesday, September 15, 2004, in Moses Lake, Washington at the Amerihost Inn, 1157 N. Stratford Road. The DNR plane will not be available for this meeting. Please call ahead to reserve your room. You can call 1-509-764-7500 to make your reservation now.